	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/869,676	ZAHORANSKY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Tim Heitbrink	1722
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>pending</u>		
(1) <u>Tim Heitbrink</u> .	(3)	
(2) Albert Ferro.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 March 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Claims discussed: 8,10,12,15,16,24,25,27,40,41		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Mr. Ferro agreed to the changes found in the Examiner's 112 and further clarify applicants' invention.	E GENERAL NATURE OF WHA s Amendment. Such changes were	T WAS DISCUSSED: made to conform the claims to 35 USC
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed directly resulted in the allowance of the applicated of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	tion. <del>The examiner will provide</del> eabove.  Eparate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
		•
Vin Neiebrick		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	applicant/Applicant's Represent	ative Signature – if appropriate)